

Richard J. Estlin's

TRUTH LETTER

An Antidote to Official Mendacity and Newsfaking in the Press

Vol. III, No. 2

October 1, 1970

Guest Editorial (by Jane Fonda): "American Society is a monster".

Another Government Lie Exposed

In bizarre fashion, yet another blatant falsehood assiduously propagated by the U.S. Government has been nailed. When the Palestinian air pirates presented their first list of demands on Sept. 7, 1970, one of their conditions for setting their hostages free was the release from prison of Sirhan B. Sirhan; later his name was dropped from the roster of Arab guerrillas the skyjackers wanted to exchange for their hostages.

Now, as TRUTH LETTER readers are well aware, U.S. Government spokesmen have steadfastly maintained - and circulated this false information to the press - that Sirhan never left the United States after immigrating to this country with his parents allegedly in 1957 at the age of 12. On the basis of the precise information supplied by British journalist Jon Kimche from official Arab government records, I showed up the total falsity of this version in Chapter II ("Sirhan of the C.I.A.") of my TRILOGY OF MURDER (Vol. I, Nos. 5 through 10). In that chapter, I gave precise details of the several trips to Egypt, Syria and Jordan which Sirhan made in 1964-1966 and of the military training he underwent in at least two Palestinian guerrilla camps.

Striking confirmation of all this has now been provided by the fact that the air pirates included Sirhan's name in their initial list of Palestinian prisoners to be released in exchange for the hostages. For, it stands to reason that they would not have done so if they did not consider him one of their own. They could not have any conceivable interest in seeking the release of a man who came to the U.S. as a small boy and stayed in that far-off country uninterruptedly until he made a niche for himself in S^{en} Quentin's death row by shooting a Catholic senator he didn't know and had no grudge against.

No sooner had this original guerrilla demand been announced than Nixon went into an urgent conclave with CIA chief Richard Helms and FBI boss J. Edgar Hoover. Immediately after that meeting, the Palestinians dropped their demand for Sirhan's release. It is hard to tell, of course, what happened. One possibility is that the U.S. Government, scared stiff by the thought that the release of Sirhan might bring to light his CIA affiliations, promptly offered a substantial inducement to the guerrilla leaders in order to get the Sirhan case separated from those of the captured skyjackers held in British, German and Swiss prisons. It is also possible, on the other hand, that the Palestinians, after having put forward their demand for the release of Sirhan, came to realize that he wasn't exactly a freedom fighter, but a CIA agent who had been sent to infiltrate the guerrilla organizations in 1964-66.

Whatever happened, the official myth of the young Jordanian immigrant who severed all ties with the old country and never left the U.S., "even briefly, after immigrating here" (as an official statement by Robert J. McVloskey, then press officer of the State Department, put it on June 14, 1968) now has been thoroughly shattered. Another scrawny chicken has come home to roost.

READER'S FORUM

From a letter sent by Madeline Coddard, Bellport, N.Y.:

"... I believe that bloodstains found on the outside rear collar area of Mary Jo Kopechne's shirt and on the back of both sleeves, especially the right sleeve, are explained by the process of extricating her body from the rear of the car. John Farrar carried her out of the car by the right rear window. The window was blown out but fragments of glass were still in evidence around the periphery of the window frame and these may have caused some minor scrapes and scratches. Whatever the injuries, they were evidently so slight that they were either not noticed or discounted by Dr. Mills. (The Inquest, EVR Production, p.40). Perhaps Farrar cut his hands on the broken glass and the blood spread to her blouse. The likelihood that this is what caused the bloodstains is reinforced by the fact that Mr. Gargan's chest, arm and back got badly scraped from his getting into the overturned car. He tried at first to get in through the window (The Inquest, p.34)..."

I'm afraid I cannot go along with this reasoning. In the first place, dead bodies don't bleed, least of all from minor scrapes and scratches. Therefore, if the bleeding had occurred during the process of getting the body out of the car, it couldn't have been Mary Jo's blood that would have smeared her blouse. It would have had to be Farrar's - and then he, or somebody else on the scene, would certainly have noticed it or remarked about it. (Miss Coddard writes that she queried Mr. Farrar about this matter, but received no reply, which is of itself indicative that he was not hurt). Secondly, if the bleeding was caused by scrapes and scratches so slight "that they were either not noticed or discounted by Dr. Mills", how come the blood could have soaked deeply into the fabric of Mary Jo's blouse and over a wide area at that? Moreover, both Farrar and the body he was hauling ashore were immersed in water after the supposed scraping by fragments of glass still in the window frame and the blood therefore would have been instantly washed away. Certainly it could never have soaked into the blouse any more than the "very small amount" of blood which, Dr. Mills thought, might have come from the mouth and nose of the drowning woman. (cf. page 3 of the present issue). Finally, I would like to point out that the language of Dr. McHugh's testimony (TL, III/1) is unmistakable and conclusive. He speaks of "blood at one time originally present on the rear collar etc.", of "residual traces of blood" and of "washed-out stains." If there were washed-out stains, it stands to reason that the blood must have been present in the fabric before Mary Jo hit the water.

There is simply no two ways about it: Mary Jo was injured and caused to bleed profusely before the so-called accident. And, since her body showed no visible injuries under superficial examination, there is practically no alternative to my thesis that the bleeding occurred when she was stabbed with a syringe.

Mr. Joesten - This is a magnificent work you are doing re Ted Kennedy. One brother, the President, assassinated. The second brother, a Senator, assassinated. Why cannot people see that a foulness would be done to the third brother? -

Gratefully (signed) E. Wardell-Hall (Los Angeles, California)

TL readers will be interested to know that a German-language version of "The Truth about Chappaquiddick" will be published in eight instalments, beginning Sept. 25, 1970, in the internationally known Swiss weekly Die Weltwoche of Zurich. Also, a major German book publisher has expressed keen interest in this manuscript. He writes: "... your thesis of murder is bewildering, but the circumstantial evidence you present is convincing..." Thus, in Europe, anyway, the facts of THE MURDER OF MARY JO KOPECHNE will soon become widely known. Chances are, though, that in the United States, Canada and England TL readers will remain the only people to learn the truth about this case.

On the occasion of his mid-August trip to Wilkes-Barre, Dinis let go with this forthright blast at Dr. Mills: "I can't accept this man's findings at all. I can't accept anything he says. He has tried unfairly and untruthfully from the first day to shift the blame for not conducting an autopsy to this office." (New York Post, 8-15-69)

In the same context, the NY Post quoted a strange remark made, according to Mills, by Dinis, to wit that he wanted "to keep his office out of the case to prevent it from becoming another Lee Harvey Oswald affair." (Jack Olsen also quotes this bizarre statement in his book).

Now what on earth did the DA mean by that? How can one compare the assassination of a President to a fatal automobile accident? Yet there was a hidden meaning behind this seemingly incomprehensible statement, as we shall see. Dinis, for one, suspects, if he does not actually know, the whole truth of the matter.

"I can't accept this man's findings at all," the DA said with considerable justification. Yet Judge Boyle did, on a crucial issue. Evidently, local loyalties prevailed over legal considerations.

When Dr. Mills took the stand on Jan. 7, 1970, he was told by the Court:

"Expert evidence already introduced has indicated that that white blouse was subjected to chemical analysis and shows evidence of blood." "Now, assuming that that white blouse was the one worn by the decedent at the time you examined her, are you able to express a medical opinion with reasonable certainty whether the presence of that blood is consistent with your diagnosis of death by drowning?"

The Witness: Yes.

The Court: And what is that opinion, that it is consistent or that it is not consistent?

The Witness: That it is consistent.

The Court: With your diagnosis?

The Witness: With my diagnosis of death by drowning.

Q. Could you explain to the Court the reasons why you formed that opinion?

A. In a drowning case when a person drowns there is what we call an exacerbation of blood or a putting out of blood from the lungs in the violent attempts to gain air and blood may and I believe usually perhaps more often than not, may be evidenced in the mouth and the nose of the decedent. Such blood might, in the efforts, the physical efforts to avoid drowning, might spread I suppose almost anywhere to the person's clothing.

Q. Are you able, Doctor, to render an opinion as to how much blood normally is released from this kind of death?

The Court: Off the record. (Discussion off the record).

Q. Can you render an opinion?

A. A very small amount. I mean, less than half a cupful for example.

Mr. Fernandez: I am satisfied, Doctor. I have no other questions.

The Court: I have no further questions."

And so, unbelievably, it went. In such desultory fashion, the key issue of the whole Inquest - or what should have been the key issue, anyway, - was disposed of. This incident proves by itself, that the truth about the death of Mary Jo Kopechne was deliberately hushed up in Judge Boyle's court and that the DA, knowing full well that a murder was being covered up, agreed and even declared himself "satisfied."

The "Opinion" expressed by Dr. Mills in the case is probably the most fantastic ever set forth by a medical examiner in a court of law, in our time. Its absurdity hits you right between the eyes.

Note, in the first place, the multiple reservations with which Dr. Mills surrounds his "opinion:" Blood "may" be pressed forth from the lungs, but that's not always the case. He believes it happens "usually perhaps more often than not," but cites no authority for this belief. Such blood "might" spread "almost anywhere" to the person's clothing.

How could a few drops of blood emanating from the mouth and nose of a person lying submerged in several feet of salt water that's eddying back and forth through the shattered windows of the car, not just spread to the back of her collar and down the backside of her sleeves, but penetrate the fabric so deeply that, months later, "unusually strong" (Dr. McHugh) reaction to benzidine tests can be detected?

Is it not obvious to anyone in his right mind that those few drops of blood, or rather foam, would be instantly diluted and washed away by the motion of the water, that they would never, under any circumstances, be able to seep into any kind of cloth and leave there "residual traces of blood" (Dr. McHugh) clearly detectable under chemical analysis?

Imagine a medical examiner dispensing such nonsense at a murder trial. Why, he would be, at best, laughed out of court. At worst, he would be flayed by half a dozen experts testifying for the prosecution and proving on the basis of precedent that such a thing has never happened and could never happen.

Yet, unbelievably again, Judge Boyle not only let it go at that, but ^{blandly} dismissed the whole grave matter in his report with the words: "Expert evidence was introduced that chemical analysis of the blouse worn by Kopechne showed blood stains, but medical evidence proved (emphasis mine - J.J.) this was not inconsistent with death by drowning. (Exhibit 31)."

How dare the Judge say that Mills had proved his point when he had, in fact, done no more than set forth a vague, repeatedly qualified, thoroughly unsubstantiated hypothesis that flies in the face of common sense, elementary logic and rudimentary physics?

What is the explanation, then, for the presence of blood stains all over Mary Jo's blouse when it is equally well established that her body showed no external marks whatsoever, no lesions, no cuts, no bruises - nothing?

There is one explanation and again I feel convinced that it is the only one possible: When Mary Jo was put to sleep ~~with~~ through an injection - or possibly several - of a stupefying mixture with a strong alcoholic content, the syringe with which she was stabbed hit an artery and thus caused profuse bleeding. It may even have been intentional, for the purpose of the whole operation was to incriminate Edward Kennedy and the discovery of blood on her blouse, along with a high level of alcohol in her blood, would certainly make the odds in his disfavor hard to beat.

Chapter II

An Impossible Accident

I have already made some brief references to Jack Olsen's book "The Bridge at Chappaquiddick." Now we must deal with it at some length, for the author has rendered a great service to the truth, even though in his final conjecture he goes wildly astray (see below).

Olsen, a professional reporter, did extensive on-the-spot research which enabled him to reach two conclusions that are, in my view, unassailable:

One, it was practically impossible for the accident to occur in the manner described by Kennedy;

And two, Kennedy was not in the car when it went off the bridge. His entire account of how he thrashed around in the submerged car, first fighting for his own life, and then heroically diving again and again, trying to rescue Mary Jo, is pure, unadulterated fabrication.

The Frameup of James Earl Ray (std. from Vol. III, No.1)

"The death slug was identical in all physical characteristics to the five loaded .30-aught-6 cartridges found in the bag in front of Canipe," said Beasley. (Comment: "They are admitting that one rifle slug is like another one.")

"The cartridge (Editor's Note: This was found on the bathroom floor of the roominghouse) had in fact been fired in this .30-aught-6 rifle." (Comment: "But he isn't saying anything about ballistics.")

"That the death slug removed from the body contained land and groove impressions consistent with those present in the barrel of the rifle." (Comment: "Ballistics is a precise, positive science. He is not saying the bullet was fired from the rifle. The land and groove marks on any rifle bullet are consistent with those from any other rifle. They are not a positive ballistics match. I'd love to have this on cross-examination.")...

Precisely. Any lawyer worth his salt would have loved to have the State of Tennessee's case against James Earl Ray on cross-examination. And any competent lawyer would have made a fool out of Asst. Attorney-General Beasley by showing up the emptiness of his pseudo-ballistics. "Consistent" was a term the Warren Commission also loved and consistently misused to juggle the facts. A positive matching of death slug and rifle is evidence; nothing else in the above-quoted Beasley verbiage is. That's why an honest trial with cross-examination of witnesses and experts had to be avoided at all costs. And that is also why the prosecution, the FBI and Ray's disloyal lawyer Percy Foreman all conspired in the most outrageous manner to bring such irresistible pressure to bear on the helpless defendant that he would plead guilty to a murder he had not committed.

Ray's first lawyer, Arthur J. Hanes, also played an ambiguous and contradictory game in the case. As long as he was Ray's attorney-of-record, he held that his client did not and could not have killed Dr. King, but later he chose to straddle the issue. One need only compare the information supplied to Saga by Hanes' former associate, the private detective Renfro Hays, to an article written by Hanes himself that was published in Look (4-15-69) to appreciate the extraordinary ambivalence displayed by this lawyer.

To quote first from Saga again:

"... Hanes says, 'The .30-06 rifle found in the doorway was not the rifle used to kill Martin Luther King and the FBI knows it (emphasis added - J.J.)'

"Mr. Hanes, a former agent for the FBI, is an experienced trial lawyer. He has examined the bullet removed from King's body. 'The slug had enough markings on it to be traced to the murder weapon,' he said. 'A kid could have traced it.'

This significant quotation cuts the last bit of ground from under the feet of Frazier, Beasley and the other architects of the Ray frameup. In his affidavit, the text of which was reproduced in TL, Vol. II, No. 24, the FBI ballistics expert had stated: "Because of distortion due to mutilation and insufficient marks of value, I could draw no conclusion as to the whether or not the submitted bullet was fired from the submitted rifle."

This statement effectively lets Ray out, as I have pointed out above, but it also leaves open, or rather evades, the question of the real murder weapon. The FBI, knowing full well that the death slug had not been fired from the rifle that could be traced to Ray, was determined to prevent the identification of the real killer. That's why Frazier claimed there were insufficient marks of value on the slug, while Hanes, also formerly of the FBI, states flatly that the markings were so plentiful and clear "a kid could have traced" the slug to the murder weapon.

Dishonesty - Thy Name is FBI!

(to be continued)